

PERSONALITY VARIABLES  
OF PROSPECTIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL  
COUNSELORS

By  
HARRY ALFRED DANIELSON

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF  
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA  
April, 1967

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge assistance rendered by his supervisory committee. Dr. Bert Sharp, Chairman, contributed leadership and direction and, yet, consistently permitted considerable latitude in the development and expression of ideas. Dr. Audrey Schumacher and Dr. James Lister made important suggestions and provided timely support and encouragement.

This investigation could not have been accomplished without the cooperation of Directors and students of four NDEA Counseling and Guidance institutes. Their help is appreciated.

Sacrifice required of the writer's family--Marjorie, Jay, Dick, and Jim--often surpassed that demanded of the writer. Without their constant inspiration there would have been little incentive to persist. In addition, Jay contributed several unselfish hours to assist with proofreading data for the tables.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	v
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
Recent Professional Developments. . . . .	1
Conceptual Basis for Study. . . . .	2
Early Research in Counselor Personality . . . . .	4
Need for Study of Elementary Counselors . . . . .	6
Statement of Problem. . . . .	11
Summary . . . . .	12
II REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH . . . . .	14
Differences between Counselors and Others . . . . .	14
Changes Occurring during Preparation. . . . .	18
Summary . . . . .	23
III METHOD AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	25
Subjects. . . . .	25
The Instrument. . . . .	29
Collection of Data. . . . .	34
Statistical Method. . . . .	34
Summary . . . . .	36
IV PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . .	38
First Hypothesis. . . . .	38
Second Hypothesis . . . . .	45
Third Hypothesis. . . . .	53
Summary . . . . .	57

# TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	63
Summary . . . . .	63
Conclusions . . . . .	64
Implications. . . . .	71
REFERENCES. . . . .	77

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Characteristics of Enrollees at Four Counseling and Guidance Institutes. . . . .	28
2	Comparison of Elementary Counselors and Other Counselors on the EPPS--Pretest. . . . .	39
3	Comparison of Institute A and Institute B on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest . . . . .	40
4	Comparison of Institute C and Institute D on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest . . . . .	41
5	Comparison of All Men and All Women on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest. . . . .	41
6	Comparison of Elementary Men and Elementary Women on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest. . . . .	42
7	Comparison of Other Men and Other Women on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest . . . . .	42
8	Comparison of Elementary Men and Other Men on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest . . . . .	43
9	Comparison of Elementary Women and Other Women on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest. . . . .	44
10	Rank Order of Needs for Elementary Counselors and Other Counselors on the EPPS--Pretest. . . . .	46
11	Comparison of Elementary Counselors and Other Counselors on the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	47
12	Comparison of Institute A and Institute B on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	48
13	Comparison of Institute C and Institute D on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	48
14	Comparison of All Men and All Women on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest. . . . .	49

# LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table		Page
15	Comparison of Elementary Men and Elementary Women on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	50
16	Comparison of Other Men and Other Women on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	50
17	Comparison of Elementary Men and Other Men on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	50
18	Comparison of Elementary Women and Other Women on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest. . . . .	51
19	Rank Order of Needs for Elementary Counselors and Other Counselors on the EPPS--Posttest . . . . .	52
20	Comparison of EPPS Pretest and Posttest--Elementary Counselors. . . . .	54
21	Comparison of EPPS Pretest and Posttest--Institute A. . . . .	55
22	Comparison of EPPS Pretest and Posttest--Institute B. . . . .	55
23	Comparison of EPPS Pretest and Posttest--Elementary Men . . . . .	56
24	Comparison of EPPS Pretest and Posttest--Elementary Women . . . . .	56
25	Rank Order of Needs for Elementary Counselors on the EPPS--Pretest and Posttest. . . . .	58

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this investigation was to compare personal needs of prospective elementary school counselors with needs of counselors being prepared for secondary and junior college positions. Comparisons were made at the beginning and end of an academic year. Additional attention was accorded changes in personality which occurred during preparation of the elementary counselors.

Chapter I will discuss factors pertinent to the selection of this problem and will state the specific hypotheses which were tested.

#### Recent Professional Developments

Concern for the quality of American education prompted the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This act enabled a significant increase in the number of trained counselors in secondary schools. Pierson (1965) reported that during the first five years that universities operated academic-year NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes under provisions of the act, 1,955 persons were prepared to serve as secondary school counselors.

As Dugan (1960) predicted, this increase in numbers realistically led to more thoughtful consideration of policies of selection, retention, and endorsement of school counselors. The American Personnel and Guidance Association assumed a role of leadership in this and related issues. During 1959 the Association for Counselor Education

and Supervision, a division of APGA, initiated a five-year study of existing practices in the preparation of secondary school counselors. Over 1,000 members of the counseling profession were involved in this self-scrutiny, and the resulting recommendations for counselor education are presently being applied on a tentative basis by several universities. One section of the standards for counselor education (APGA, 1964), "Selection, Retention, Endorsement and Placement," includes both of the following statements.

"The institution administers a planned program of selective retention" (p. 1068).

"Endorsement is given only on the basis of evidence of proficiency. This implies that the candidate has completed a substantial part of his graduate work in counselor education, including a supervised counseling experience, at the endorsing institution, and that his personal growth is considered to have been satisfactory" (p. 1068).

It is significant that the standards recommend not only assessment of didactic phases of the program but personal growth factors as well. In fact, an earlier section recommends that there be "... a planned program for assessing attitudinal and behavioral changes in students as they move through the counselor education program" (p. 1064).

#### Conceptual Basis for Study

Interest in personality characteristics of counselors was not fathered by these recommendations however. Counselor personality has long been of concern to thoughtful leaders in the profession and has



been considered of special consequence by those who conceive of the interpersonal factor as being vital to successful counseling and who see the counselor as an important contributor to this relationship. It has been pointed out by Steffire, King, & Leafgren (1962) that counseling involves an interaction of at least four variables: the client, the counselor, the problem, and the setting within which counseling takes place. They maintain, however, that counselor educators must operate as though the counselor is the crucial variable, since he is the one that can be influenced appreciably by a training program.

Rogers (1957, 1962) has said that constructive personality growth and development results when the client experiences a certain psychological climate which is fostered by the counselor. If the counselor brings ". . . to the helping relationship certain attitudinal ingredients . . ." (1962, p. 417), the quality of the encounter is likely to be growth-facilitating. Counselor-offered conditions of congruence, empathy, and unconditional positive regard play a more vital role than methodology, technique, and academic sophistication. Rogers advises as much emphasis during preparation ". . . on the interpersonal experiences as on intellectual learning" (1962, p. 427).

Arbuckle (1958), Tyler (1953), and Murphy (1960) are among others who have pointed out the importance of personal characteristics of the counselor in achieving effective therapeutic relationships. Murphy, for example, has advocated more attention to personality and interpersonal relationships and less to technical skill and states that the selection and preparation of counselors is ". . . a matter of sound, rich, generous, and wise personality . . ." (p. 22).

Wyatt (1948), considering therapy as a psychoanalyst, views the contribution of personality much the same as do these others. He feels that the therapist's own needs do much to facilitate or hinder the counseling process, and thus, is likely to re-enact his whole life style within the duration of the counseling session. Therapy, to Wyatt, is ". . . a delicate interaction which has to be appropriate to its avowed purpose but otherwise leaves the therapist as natural and spontaneous as he can be" (p. 86).

#### Early Research in Counselor Personality

Despite continuing interest in personality of counselors, it has been only recently that systematic research has been conducted in this area. Studies initially focused on the employed person and typically attempted to identify personality traits associated with counselors considered to be successful. Jones (1951) reviewed a number of these studies and concluded that, although descriptive, they were not comparative, since they elicited little information that was not characteristic of school personnel in general.

That counselor educators were uninvolved in systematic assessment of personality of counselor trainees can be demonstrated by citing Barry & Wolf's (1958) categorization of the articles published in the Personnel and Guidance Journal during the preceding five years. They discovered that only 14 articles of the 411 published dealt with any phase of counselor preparation and that only two of those could be classified as research.

One series of studies conducted during the 1950's which did have implications for counselor education involved the attempts of Cottle and his associates (Cottle & Lewis, 1954; Cottle, Lewis, & Penney, 1954; Cottle, Pownall, & Steimel, 1955) to devise scales which would differentiate counselors from other professionals in education and psychology. Although their efforts were not altogether successful, they aroused interest in the assessment of counselor personality.

As recently as the beginning of the present decade, Hill & Green (1960) were able to report little research in this field. Most efforts were in the nature of status studies similar to those of Wellman (1955) and Santaviceca (1959). Both investigations indicated that institutions assuming responsibility for the preparation of counselors placed most emphasis on academic potential when evaluating applicants. Many other important variables such as counseling aptitude, emotional maturity, and interest in others were not amenable to objective observation at the time of application and were more likely to be evaluated as training progressed.

Since 1960, perhaps because of the increased availability of subjects in the person of students enrolled in Counseling and Guidance Institutes, there has been more and more research examining the personality characteristics of counselor candidates. Stripling & Lister (1963) and Cash & Munger (1966) were able to report increased attention to this topic in the professional literature. Studies of this nature have usually been one of three types: investigations of personality differences between counselor trainees and some other professional group, evaluations of changes in personality which tend to

occur during counselor preparation, or assessments of the personalities of "good" counselors as compared with "poor" counselors. The first two types are relevant to this investigation. Related studies will be reviewed in Chapter II.

#### Need for Study of Elementary Counselors

Although there has been increasing attention to personality of counselor candidates, until recently it has been difficult to explore personality characteristics that may be unique to those people seeking preparation as elementary school counselors. In the past there have been few prospective elementary counselors engaged in training at any one time or place, and study of these people has not been feasible. During the 1965-1966 academic year, however, three universities conducted Counseling and Guidance Institutes which prepared approximately 90 counselors for elementary schools. Eight institutions are engaged in the preparation of over 180 elementary counselors as part of the NDEA program during 1966-1967.

The entire field of elementary guidance is one characterized by ambiguity and contradiction. Because guidance services to elementary school children have existed in such limited scope that optimal utilization of helping personnel remains largely undefined, counselors prepared to work at this level find few criteria by which to establish their role and function. Neither historical precedent nor empirical evidence exist.

From the very inception of elementary guidance programs there has been uncertainty as to what should be required of the professional.

Cottle (1953) expressed this doubt when he wrote, "It seems necessary to identify clearly each area and level of counseling because it is not apparent whether the characteristics of counselors in each area and at each level within an area are the same or different" (p. 445).

Several recent surveys demonstrate that the question of role and function remains unresolved. In a survey of 154 programs designed to prepare elementary guidance personnel, Hill & Nitzschke (1961) found that the eventual function of candidates was not well defined by professional preparation and that only about 40 per cent of the programs made an attempt to provide experiences explicitly related to the elementary level.

Hill (1963) reported that a review of the standards of 10 state departments of education revealed considerable ambiguity as to who supplied what guidance services in the elementary school. Several states, although asserting that such services were operational, completely avoided describing them.

Moore (1966) discovered that public school personnel hold varied opinions as to the optimal role of elementary counselors. Three major views emerged from his survey. The first view saw the counselor as an ". . . administrative manipulator in the proper arrangement of relations with the pupil's environment. Consulting and referring of individual pupils receives emphasis" (p. 5240). The second concept was of ". . . a counseling specialist concerned primarily for the satisfactory adjustment of the pupil to learning experiences. His primary contacts are directly with the pupil . . ." (p. 5240). The third view was of a counselor ". . . who assists teachers, principals, parents,

and others as the need arises. He uses a variety of approaches such as consulting, counseling, testing, diagnosing, and referring" (p. 5240).

Contradiction as to role and function is certainly not confined to the elementary setting. Counselors at all levels are plagued by questions of this nature. However, one facet of this issue seems unique to the elementary school; that is, whether guidance personnel should emphasize counseling contacts directly with children or serve pupil needs by consulting with teachers and other adults and by helping to coordinate the efforts of the entire school program. Although this question is often raised specifically, many times it is implied within the context of related issues. Persons capable of supplying considerable definition for the goals of elementary counseling have reacted to this issue in contradictory fashion.

The American Personnel and Guidance Association (1966) recently published the preliminary statement of a committee established to study the role of the elementary counselor. The committee adopted the position that elementary counselors should perform functions similar to those traditionally recommended for secondary schools. Counseling was seen as the first responsibility. Consultation and coordination were not neglected, but emphasis was placed on direct contacts with students.

In agreement with this approach, Nelson (1966) has said, "We should commit ourselves to the term elementary counselor as being most descriptive of the functions we expect to perform" (p. 10). He further maintains that experience shows that young children are able to enter



into satisfactory counseling relationships and predicts a trend away from an emphasis on consulting activities toward more emphasis on counseling.

McDougall & Reitan (1963) found that many elementary principals share Nelson's view. They reported that 66 per cent of the principals contacted in a three-state survey perceive the elementary counselor as being more involved with special services to individual students than with general curriculum guidance for all.

Others of influence, however, feel that the purposes of elementary counseling virtually preclude a role similar to that of many secondary school counselors. Mahan (1965) has described a role focusing on the school itself and sees the counselor providing a broad range of services which will influence pupil behavior through management of groups. He feels that the counselor should study demographic characteristics of both the school population and the community and manipulate environmental conditions so as to facilitate desired results. "In this fashion, he will be clearly distinct from the secondary school counselor who emphasizes a one-to-one relationship based on a verbal interchange" (p. 73).

Johnston (1966) is another who explicitly mentions the difference between secondary and elementary counselors. "The function of the elementary school guidance worker is distinct from that of the high school counselor as usually defined. Qualifications should be determined with this difference in mind" (p. 25). In fact, he stresses that the elementary guidance worker is not a counselor but a consultant

whose job is ". . . to help teachers understand children better and adapt instruction to their needs" (p. 24).

The United States Office of Education also tends to favor the consulting function at the elementary level, and a recent publication includes a chapter, "Preparation of the Guidance Consultant" (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965a, pp. 17-22).

Faust (1965) recommends an elementary guidance program emphasizing curriculum-planning and designed to improve the child's cognitive functioning. He thinks that the same type of experience which enables a child to operate more effectively intellectually also facilitates his efficiency in other behavioral areas. Therefore, the major goal should not be ". . . to assist students to make better personal or emotional adjustments; nor, for that matter, to aid students in career and educational choices and planning" (p. 19). Rather, changes should be effected through the curriculum, classroom management, and methods of instruction. "Entire guidance and counseling systems or organizations constructed to assist students in choices or decision-making would be practically unnecessary" (pp. 19-20). Few contacts with students would be necessary for, although the aim of the program would be to help individuals, it would operate through teachers and ". . . with less emphasis on direct student contact and work with individuals" (p. 20).

Thus, it is seen that among those in position to help shape the future of guidance and counseling in elementary schools there is a marked lack of consensus as to which guidance responsibilities should be emphasized. There would appear to be considerable merit in the



observation of Shertzer & Stone (1966) that in the immediate future school systems will conduct programs of elementary guidance based upon widely divergent rationale, and that these programs will likely be contingent upon those competencies that new personnel happen to possess. That is, because of the absence of long-established policy, new elementary counselors will be able to emphasize responsibilities consistent with individual strengths and interests.

It is the writer's conviction that personal needs of the counselor will determine the guidance services to be provided as much as will his academic preparation. If, indeed, this is the case, data that have been gathered within the framework of this study should not only be descriptive of the manifest needs of elementary counselors but also permit speculation as to areas of responsibility most likely to receive attention from these new counselors.

#### Statement of Problem

Regardless of philosophy, theoretical rationale, or bias as to eventual role and function of prospective elementary school counselors, counselor educators face a common problem. They cannot effectively plan an academic climate designed to foster desired personality growth until they know what personality characteristics are typical of new students and what personality changes are facilitated by existing programs. The purpose of this investigation was to acquire data that might prove meaningful to the increasing number of counselor educators who are assuming responsibility for the selection, preparation, retention, and endorsement of elementary school counselors.

The pattern of personal needs manifested by prospective elementary school counselors was determined and compared with needs typical of other prospective counselors. The changes in manifest needs that occurred during preparation of elementary counselors were also investigated.

Three specific hypotheses were tested. They were:

1. Statistically significant differences will be observed between the manifest needs of prospective elementary school counselors and those of other prospective counselors at the beginning of academic preparation.

2. Statistically significant differences will be observed between the manifest needs of prospective elementary school counselors and those of other prospective counselors at the completion of academic preparation.

3. Statistically significant differences will be observed between the manifest needs of prospective elementary school counselors at the beginning of academic preparation and those at the completion of training.

### Summary

Counselor personality and its influence upon the counseling process has long been an important theoretical concept. Until recently, however, little research was accomplished in this area. Federal legislation and activity by professional groups have focused attention on the personality characteristics of counselor candidates, and Counseling and Guidance Institutes have provided significant

numbers of students at comparable stages of preparation permitting a more systematic exploration of personality variables.

Prospective elementary school counselors were seen as an especially appropriate target for research of this intent. Elementary guidance is relatively new, and little has been known about those who seek positions in this field. It was anticipated that a comparison of personality variables of counselor candidates at the elementary level with other prospective counselors would prove useful to those persons planning programs designed to facilitate the personal growth of other prospective elementary school counselors and, further, that this assessment might provide some indication as to which professional activities are most likely to meet personal needs of elementary counselors.

## CHAPTER 11

### REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The past few years have seen increased consideration of many phases of counselor education including scrutiny of attitudes, values, and needs of counselors. This review of literature will be limited to research that examined personality differences between counselors and other occupational groups or that focused upon personality changes that occurred during periods of preparation as counselors.

#### Differences between Counselors and Others

Holt (1962) discovered that counselor candidates, employed teachers, and employed counselors scored significantly higher than did graduate students in agriculture or arts and sciences on the Cyclothymia scale of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PFQ) and on the Affiliation, Intracception, and Succorance scales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). The counselor trainees could be distinguished from all others by lower scores on the Protension scale of the 16PFQ.

Vocational value differences between counselor trainees and administrators working on an advanced degree were examined by Steffire & Leafgren (1962). The Vocational Values Inventory indicated that 40 prospective counselors scored higher at the .01 level of significance on both Altruism and Self-realization, while 23 administrators scored higher on Control at the .01 level and on Money at the .05 level. When

the values were ranked, however, the correlation was .86. The value of Control provided the major difference. It was ranked fifth by counselors and third by administrators.

The EPPS was used in a study (Mott, 1962) which compared counselor-education majors, counselors, and graduate students in administration. Five scales discriminated. Counseling majors scored lower at the .01 level than either of the other groups on Deference and Order and higher at the .05 level than either group on Heterosexuality. At the .01 level, they were lower than administrators but higher than employed counselors on Dominance and lower than employed counselors but higher than administrators on Abasement.

A similar investigation (Kemp, 1964) found that the need structures of 45 counselors, 45 teachers, and 45 secondary principals varied on 10 of the 15 scales of the EPPS. Counselors achieved significantly higher scores than did school principals on Exhibition, Affiliation and Intracception, but they scored lower on Achievement, Deference, Order, Endurance, and Aggression. Counselors were higher than teachers on Exhibition, Affiliation, and Intracception, but lower on Order, Succorance, and Nurturance. Differences for Intracception were most significant since they exceeded the value required for the .001 level of confidence.

Foley (1964) discovered that items on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) discriminated between the 'most promising' of counselor trainees engaged in full-time study and other education students. When the students were divided on the basis of sex, 84 items

discriminated between the two groups of males, and 32 items served to differentiate between the two groups of females.

A dissertation by Smith (1964) focused on the personality characteristics of recent graduates who had just received doctorates in either guidance or other fields of education. The EPPS was used in this study also, and it showed that guidance graduates were significantly higher than other graduates on scales assessing needs for Intimacy, Nurturance, and Heterosexuality. They were lower on Deference, Order, and Aggression. Differences for Nurturance and Heterosexuality were at the .05 level; the others exceeded the values required for the .01 level.

Whetstone (1964, 1965) investigated the personality structures of 25 counselors-in-training as compared with 25 teachers rated as "effective." He used three instruments: a Q sort describing the "ideal student," the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values, and the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study. Although there were more similarities than differences, he felt the differences were important ones. Counselors were seen as being more generous and more interested in helping the unfortunate. They were inclined to focus on sources of frustration, while teachers tended to protect themselves from frustration and acted in a more conforming manner.

When the MMPI was utilized to compare "successful" students majoring in guidance and educational psychology with other graduate students in education as well as with "rejects and drop-outs" from the field of guidance and psychology, the results were inconclusive (Khatun, 1965). Although a few scales appeared to differentiate,



Khatun felt that reliance on the MMPI as a selection instrument should await further research involving larger samples.

Foley & Proff (1965) felt that data on enrollees selected for Guidance Institutes were necessary to guide future selection. In addition to the MMPI and EPPS, they used the Miller Analogies Test and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) to compare 447 Guidance Institute enrollees with 558 vocational rehabilitation trainees. There was little difference in measured cognitive ability, and although affective differences were statistically significant, the authors felt they were too small for any practical value. The SVIB, however, proved to be both significant and practically meaningful. Those psychological positions which involved interest in individual behavior deviations were higher for the vocational rehabilitation counselors; Guidance Institute enrollees seemed more interested in normative behavior within a social setting.

Degree of student-centeredness was the focus of a comparison among counselors-in-training, secondary school teachers, and school administrators (Knock, 1966). Scores on the Professional Activity Inventory indicated that those preparing to be school counselors appeared more student-centered than did employed teachers or administrators. Perhaps of greater significance than the major intent of the study was a supplemental investigation. The counselors-in-training were subdivided into two groups: members of a Guidance Institute who had been subjected to a thorough preadmission screening and other counseling students whose only criterion for admission was acceptance

to graduate school. These two subgroups did not differ significantly on the degree of student-centeredness.

### Changes Occurring during Preparation

One of the first studies of this type was that done by Clark (1959). A battery of instruments--Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS), Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS), Educational Interest Inventory, and a specially prepared Opinionnaire for Counselors--as well as three recorded interviews were used to examine change occurring during a Guidance Institute. Significant at the .05 level were increases in Heterosexuality and Exhibition on the EPPS and a decrease in Restraint on the GZTS during preparation. During the follow-up period of six months Dominance increased on the EPPS, and the Affiliation and Exhibition scales of the same instrument decreased at the .05 level.

Kenney (1960) explored the change that occurred during the practicum experience of 24 counselor trainees and found that ratings of real self and ideal self varied during training. Also reported were significant changes on three scales of the EPPS. Decreased scores resulted in the areas of Deference and Endurance, and the score for Heterosexuality increased. The subjects had been assigned to one of three groups according to high, average, or low ratings of self on a Q sort. Except for "minor exceptions," changes were not related to the level of a group.

Holt (1962), in addition to exploring differences between counselor personality and that of other groups, also looked at changes



which occurred during preparation. He chose six of the variables from the EPPS and five from the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PFQ) and predicted positive or negative movement for each. After one semester of training the predicted movement was indicated on eight of the variables, but it was statistically significant for only three of them. Cyclothymia on the 16PFQ and Intracception and Nurturance on the EPPS moved in a positive direction.

An attempt was made to discover significant differences on the pre- and poststatements of 37 Guidance Institute enrollees as to their own characteristics and the qualities they considered as appropriate for an ideal counselor (Bocchini, 1962). An analysis of variance failed to identify any statistically significant change in perceptions.

Caves (1962) studied 35 enrollees of a summer Guidance Institute and used a pre- and posttest design to assess changes in knowledge, counseling competency, and attitudes toward actual and ideal self. Knowledge and counseling competency, measured respectively by informational tests and recorded, constant-role interviews, increased at the .01 level. Attitudes toward self, as measured by Q sorts, did not change significantly for the group as a whole, although considerable changes were discovered in individual cases.

Jones (1963) found that change had taken place during a seven-week Guidance Institute and was still evident six months later. Examining opinionnaires completed by 30 enrollees, he found they tended to change from responses of informing and advising to accepting, listening, understanding, and permissiveness and from primary concern over

the immediate problem to concern over the total impact of the relationship.

Findings similar to those of Jones were reported by Demos & Zuwaylif (1963) when they used Porter's Test of Counselor Attitudes. They found that 40 students in a summer Guidance Institute moved from evaluation, probing, and support to understanding, reflection, and clarification. Interestingly, those counselors originally highest on these factors also tended to "improve" the most during training.

Porter's test had also been used in an earlier study by Munger & Johnson (1960) to measure change in enrollees during a summer Guidance Institute. Their findings were very similar to those of Demos & Zuwaylif. However, a follow-up (Munger, Myers, & Brown, 1963) demonstrated the need for caution when interpreting findings of this type of study. Although understanding had increased significantly during the Institute, a test three months later showed a decrease in this category, and after 27 months there were fewer "understanding responses" than on the pretest at the beginning of the Institute.

Using semantic differential techniques, Webb & Harris (1963) found that the enrollees in a six-week Guidance Institute tended to value self more highly at the completion of training than at the beginning. However, the disparity between actual self and ideal self increased, since the students' conception of ideal self had changed even more dramatically.

Winkler, Munger, Gust, & Telgland (1963) reported a deliberate effort to create an atmosphere which would facilitate perceptual change--more precisely, increased congruence among self concept, ideal

concept, and concept of others. They used members of a Science Institute as controls for a group of 29 enrollees in an academic-year Guidance Institute. A Q-sort was used. Students in the Guidance Institute changed more on the self vs. Ideal dimension than did students in the Science Institute. There were no significant changes on the other two measures.

Another investigation using Q-sorts examined real role and ideal role. Quaranta (1965) administered a Q-sort to 30 enrollees of an academic-year Guidance Institute on four different occasions. He found greater change early in the year. Enrollees' perceptions became more and more similar to those of employed counselors, especially as to ideal role.

Utilizing a cross-sectional design, Mordock & Patterson (1965) evaluated the students enrolled in four graduate courses in counseling. Since the four courses were sequential, it was assumed that the subjects represented four levels of professional preparation. Pre- and posttests were administered at the beginning and end of an eight-week session. Six scales of the California Psychological Inventory, four concepts as measured by Osgood's semantic differential technique, Rokeach's Opinionation Scale, and the Dogmatism Scale were used. Little change occurred at any given level during the eight weeks except that at the fourth level, which was a practicum, students rated the "client-centered method" and "myself as counselor" significantly higher. Students at this level scored lower than those at the other three levels on the Dogmatism Scale and on the Opinionation Scale.

Rochester (1966) used the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Study of Values and Porter's Test of Counselor Attitudes on a pre- and posttest basis to examine personality change in 229 enrollees in eight academic-year Guidance Institutes. The Study of Values revealed significant change at three of the institutes with no apparent difference between the sexes. However, those enrollees without prior counseling experience and with less than seven years' teaching experience were more amenable to personality change. Porter's test discovered change at five institutes. As measured by this instrument, male enrollees underwent greater change than did females. Again, lack of counseling experience and less teaching experience seemed to indicate more likelihood of personality change.

Among several aspects of counselor personality investigated by Wrightsman, Richard, & Noble (1966) was change in self concept which occurred as the result of a seven-week Guidance Institute and as compared with change elicited by an introductory course in guidance. The membership of the institute consisted of 25 experienced counselors, and the control group was made up of 19 graduate students. The results of pre- and posttests of the Tennessee (Department of Mental Health) Self Concept Scale disclosed several positive changes in self concept. However, on only one of the 20 measures, the Personality Disorder scale, did the experimental group experience positive personality change not also indicated by the scores of the less therapeutically oriented control group.

### Summary

Research which explored personality differences between prospective counselors and other occupational groups invariably disclosed statistically significant differences. The differences, however, were generally inconsistent, and an explicit pattern of counselor personality was not discovered through the use of standardized personality measures. Nevertheless, there was some tendency for the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to elicit from counselor trainees greater manifestations of need for Heterosexuality (Mott, 1962; Smith, 1964) and Intraception (Kemp, 1964; Smith, 1964), while lower needs for Deference (Mott, 1962; Kemp, 1964; Smith, 1964), Order (Mott, 1962; Kemp, 1964; Smith, 1964), and Aggression (Kemp, 1964; Smith, 1964) were in evidence.

Considerable variety in experimental design was revealed by an examination of those efforts to assess personality changes that occurred during counselor preparation. The studies which relied upon standardized personality instruments detected no important trends, though two of them (Clark, 1959; Kenny, 1960) resulted in increased scores on the Heterosexuality scale of the EPPS. Research which considered shifts in perceptions of self, ideal self, ideal counselor, and similar concepts produced conflicting results. The perceptions of counselor trainees became more like those of employed counselors (Quaranta, 1965), real self and ideal self became more congruent (Winkler et al., 1963), real self and ideal self became less congruent (Webb & Harris, 1963), the self concept became more positive (Wrightsmen et al., 1966), attitudes toward self showed no significant change

(Caves, 1962), and perceptions of self and the ideal counselor did not change (Bocchini, 1962). Investigations which considered the type of counseling response most likely to be chosen had more consistent results. During periods of preparation, counselor candidates became more likely to choose responses categorized as understanding, accepting, reflecting, and permissive (Demos & Zuwaylif, 1963; Jones, 1963; Munger & Johnson, 1960). Results of follow-ups indicated both persistence in this change after six months (Jones, 1963) and reversion to former choices after three and 27 months (Munger et al., 1963).

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The discussion of method and procedure utilized in this investigation will include a description of the sample and a review of the instrument which was used. A brief summary of how data were collected and statistical techniques that were employed will be included.

#### Subjects

The sample consisted of two groups of graduate students enrolled in four National Defense Education Act Counseling and Guidance Institutes during the academic year of 1965-1966.

Group I consisted of 59 students who made up the entire enrollments of two Counseling and Guidance Institutes.<sup>1</sup> These counselor candidates were preparing for positions at the elementary school level and were the main focus of the study. Hereafter they will be identified as "elementary counselors." Although one other Institute was established to prepare elementary counselors, it began approximately three months earlier than the others and was not included in this investigation.

Group II consisted of 60 enrollees who made up the entire enrollment at two other Counseling and Guidance Institutes. These students were being prepared to serve as counselors in secondary and

---

<sup>1</sup>The original enrollment. Due to resignations during the year, the final number was 56.



junior college settings and served as a group for comparative purposes. Hereafter they will be identified as "other counselors." These two Institutes were randomly selected from among 21 institutes established for the purpose of preparing counselors for levels other than elementary.

The two Counseling and Guidance Institutes included in Group I and which prepared elementary counselors will be identified as Institute A and Institute B. The two Counseling and Guidance Institutes included in Group II and which prepared other counselors will be identified as Institute C and Institute D.

Enrollees at all four Counseling and Guidance Institutes complied with eligibility requirements as established under provisions of Title V of the National Defense Education Act, amended 1964, as well as requirements of the institution itself. The basic requirement for eligibility was:

Enrollees must be persons engaged in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes, and in need of improved qualifications for this work, or teachers or instructors in such schools preparing to engage in such counseling and guidance. To meet the condition "preparing to engage in counseling and guidance" the person must be regularly engaged on a fulltime basis in classroom teaching or instruction, and must furnish satisfactory evidence of intention to do counseling and guidance at a specified educational level for which the institute is providing instruction. (U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965b, p. 3)

Thus, for purposes of selection as an enrollee, the level of eventual professional employment was a critical factor. In addition to being employed as a teacher or counselor, the applicant had to



demonstrate the likelihood that he would be employed as a counselor at the educational level for which he was to be prepared.

Although there undoubtedly was some variation among the four institutes as to specific selection criteria, all enrollees held at least a bachelor's degree, had undergone relatively little formal course work in the area of guidance and counseling, and had been accepted to do graduate work at the conducting institutions.

Demographic characteristics of enrollees are summarized in Table 1. This information was extracted from copies of Office of Education Form OE 4099-3, Enrollee Data Summary, which were supplied by the Directors of the four Counseling and Guidance Institutes involved in this research.

Table 1 reveals that the greatest difference between the two groups lies in the area where it would seem most likely to occur; i.e., elementary counselors typically came from elementary schools, and other counselors tended to come from other school settings. Both groups included more men than women; however, women represented 42.4 per cent of the elementary counselors but only 30 per cent of the other counselors. Elementary counselors tended to be somewhat older and held more advanced degrees. There was no appreciable difference in the amount of previous counseling experience.

Additional attention to the Enrollee Data Summary from each institution disclosed that both groups included representation from all geographic areas of the contiguous states as well as overseas. Elementary counselors came from 21 states, while other counselors represented 23 states.

Table 1  
Demographic Characteristics of Enrollees at  
Four Counseling and Guidance Institutes

Item	Elementary Counselors		Other Counselors	
	Institute A	Institute B	Institute C	Institute D
Sex of Enrollees:				
Males	21	13	22	20
Females	8	17	8	10
Age of Enrollees:				
21-25	6	3	7	14
26-30	8	13	8	9
31-35	8	7	5	4
36-40	5	3	7	2
41-45	2	1	2	-
46-50	-	2	1	1
51-55	-	1	-	-
Previous Degree:				
Bachelor	22	20	24	29
Master	7	10	6	1
Time Previously Assigned to Counseling:				
0%	15	23	17	19
1-24%	11	1	2	8
25-49%	-	1	3	-
50-74%	-	-	2	2
75-99%	-	-	1	-
100%	3	5	5	1

Table 1--Continued

Item	<u>Elementary Counselors</u>		<u>Other Counselors</u>	
	<u>Institute A</u>	<u>Institute B</u>	<u>Institute C</u>	<u>Institute D</u>
Level of Previous Employment:				
Elementary	27	30	-	8
Secondary	2	-	27	22
Junior College	-	-	2	-
College or University	-	-	1	-

The Instrument

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) was the instrument employed in this research. The EPPS is an untimed self-inventory of 15 personality variables measured by means of 225 pairs of items which require the respondent to choose which item best describes what he likes or how he feels.

The scales of personality characteristics measured by the EPPS were chosen from Murray's (1938) list of manifest needs. To Murray, a manifest need was an overt pattern of behavior which resulted from a hypothetical force requiring the individual to react to a given situation in a way that was hedonically satisfying. Its existence could be inferred by observing end results of behavior, typical patterns of behavior, selective responses to particular emotions or exhibitions of characteristic feelings, and manifestations of satisfaction when a certain effect was achieved or manifestations of dissatisfaction when a certain effect was not achieved.

Those of Murray's needs which Edwards chose to measure are:

1. ach Achievement: To do one's best, to be successful, to accomplish tasks requiring skill and effort, to be a recognized authority, . . .
2. def Deference: To get suggestions from others, to find out what others think, to follow instructions and do what is expected, to praise others, . . .
3. ord Order: To have written work neat and organized, to make plans before starting on a difficult task, to have things organized, to keep things neat and orderly, . . .
4. exh Exhibition: To say witty and clever things, to tell amusing jokes and stories, to talk about personal adventures and experiences, to have others notice and comment upon one's appearance, . . .
5. aut Autonomy: To be able to come and go as desired, to say what one thinks about things, to be independent of others in making decisions, to feel free to do what one wants, . . .
6. aff Affiliation: To be loyal to friends, to participate in friendly groups, to do things for friends, to form new friendships, . . .
7. int Intraception: To analyze one's motives and feelings, to observe others, to understand how others feel about problems, to put one's self in another's place, . . .
8. suc Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be kindly, to have others be sympathetic and understanding about personal problems, . . .
9. dom Dominance: To argue for one's point of view, to be a leader in groups to which one belongs, to be regarded by others as a leader, to be elected or appointed chairman of committees, . . .
10. aba Abasement: To feel guilty when one does something wrong, to accept blame when things do not go right, to feel that personal pain and misery suffered does more good than harm, to feel the need for punishment for wrong doing, . . .

11. nur Nurturance: To help friends when they are in trouble, to assist others less fortunate, to treat others with kindness and sympathy, to forgive others, . . .

12. chg Change: To do new and different things, to travel, to meet new people, to experience novelty and change in daily routine, . . .

13. end Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, . . .

14. het Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss those of the opposite sex, . . .

15. agg Aggression: To attack contrary points of view, to tell others what one thinks about them, to criticize others publicly, to make fun of others, . . . (Edwards, 1959, p. 11)

The EPPS employs situations which might well occur during day-to-day social contacts of most people. It is designed to assess ". . . relatively independent normal personality variables" (Edwards, 1959, p. 5).

An emphasis on interpersonal relationships made the EPPS an appropriate choice for this study. Pierson (1965) reported that group interaction was one of the most vital factors in the success of the 1963-1964 Counseling and Guidance Institutes. He felt that the close interpersonal relationships which invariably developed during institute programs facilitated one's sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others and permitted a more intense focus on one's own interpersonal needs. Seegars & McDonald (1963) also discovered that interaction with peers during periods of counselor training appears to increase flexibility and self-confidence, decreases tendency toward defensiveness, and results in more effective counseling.

By definition, 10 of the 15 scales measured by the EPPS relate to situations which occur only in an interpersonal context. An item-count disclosed that over two-thirds of the responses refer to others. Also, Murray's manifest need concept seems very similar to the social psychologists' action tendency, a concept that Krech, Crutchfield, & Ballachey (1962) defined as ". . . all the behavioral readinesses associated with the attitude" (p. 140) and one which has been useful in the study of attitude formation and change.

Another incentive for using the EPPS was the author's efforts to minimize effects of social desirability. Edwards attempted to overcome the probability that certain items would more likely be endorsed solely because they appear to be more socially acceptable. Using the method of successive intervals as described by Edwards & Thurstone (1952), Edwards asked 152 judges to rate 140 items representative of Murray's needs. The criterion was social desirability. Each judge placed each item in one of nine intervals, and scale values were determined by these placements. Items of equal scale value were then paired, and the subsequent forced-choice between items of a pair theoretically eliminated the social desirability factor.

It has since been demonstrated that although two given responses have equal social desirability when rated independently scaling of the same items when presented in a paired format often obtains significantly different ratings (Feldman & Corah, 1960). Despite this shortcoming, recent critics (Radcliffe, 1965; Stricker, 1965) acknowledge that the EPPS handles social desirability more effectively than do other personality measures.



Coefficients of internal consistency were reported for the 15 personality variables (Edwards, 1959). They ranged from .60 to .87 with a median of .78. The author also reported stability coefficients ranging from .74 to .88 with a median of .83. These were based on a one-week interval. When the interval was three weeks, coefficients ranged from .55 to .87 with a median of .73 (Mann, 1958).

Attempts to establish predictive validity for the EPPS have met with limited success. Two studies (Bendig, 1958; Morton, 1959) discovered correlations of about .40 between the Achievement scale and course grades. Other studies have had less success, and correlations between other scales and various criteria have generally been low (Stricker, 1965).

Radcliffe (1965) summarized a variety of studies which correlated the EPPS with various other personality instruments, among them the California Test of Personality, Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. He stated that most of these studies ". . . have not produced moderate correlations" (p. 199). Radcliffe concluded his summary of the EPPS, however, with the observation that its major strength appears to be its capacity to detect occupational and other demographic differences. In addition to research already cited in Chapter II, the EPPS has been successful in differentiating among education students, science teachers, and educational administrators (Merrill, 1960), among teachers, accountants, and mechanical engineers (Gray, 1963), and between women elementary student teachers and women secondary student teachers (Scandrette, 1962).

### Collection of Data

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) was administered on a pre- and posttest basis to all counselor candidates at four Counseling and Guidance Institutes. The pretest was administered to the enrollment of each institute by a staff member within three weeks of the beginning date of the instructional program. All test materials were returned to the University of Florida for hand-scoring, tabulation, computation, and analysis.

The posttest was administered within three weeks of the ending date of each institute. Again, results of the EPPS were processed at the University of Florida.

### Statistical Method

As already stated in Chapter I, three hypotheses were tested. The first of these was that there would be significant differences between elementary counselors and other counselors on the pretest. The second hypothesis was that there would be significant differences between elementary counselors and other counselors on the posttest. The third hypothesis was that there would be significant changes in elementary counselors between the pretest and the posttest.

Three null hypotheses were established and tested in the same manner. Since it was not predicted in what direction the differences would occur, a two-tailed  $t$  test of significance was applied. After assessing the influence of the difference in the variances by means of the  $F$  ratio, the appropriate  $t$  test was used to determine the significance of the difference in the means (Edwards, 1954; Ostle, 1954). A



difference at the .05 level was considered to be statistically significant since the investigation was of an exploratory nature and it was desirable to minimize the possibility of Type II errors.

The  $t$  test was chosen since it is used to determine ". . . whether an observed difference is of such magnitude that it cannot be attributed to chance factors or sampling variation . . ." (Edwards, 1954, p. 249). It is an especially appropriate technique when examining questions similar to the two basic issues of this investigation. Walker & Lev (1953) have said it is suitable when ". . . each individual is measured at the beginning and again at the end of an experiment and the gain is then treated as the basic measure to be studied" (p. 151). They also indicated that subjects can be paired and the difference between members of the pair becomes the measure to be studied.

Since previous research (Jackson & Guba, 1957) has demonstrated the impact of sex difference on scores, scales which differentiated between elementary counselors and other counselors were subjected to similar statistical treatment in order to evaluate the influence of sex. That is, all men were compared with all women, elementary men with elementary women, and secondary men with secondary women. Also, elementary men and secondary men were compared as well as elementary women and secondary women.

Attention was given to yet another possibility. Foley's (1964) work showed that considerable difference was evident among six institutes. He found greater differences among institutes than occurred within institutes on scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and on scales of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

Therefore, the possibility that apparent differences between elementary counselors and other counselors were, in fact, merely a function of extreme scores at just one of the four institutes was considered. Comparisons were made between the two elementary institutes and between the two other institutes for any scales of the EPPS that proved significantly different for the original groupings on either the pretest or the posttest.

Because of the ipsative nature of scores on the EPPS and the inherent difficulty in their interpretation (Bauernfeind, 1962; Redcliffe, 1965; Stricker, 1965), supplemental attention was accorded the rank order of personality variables for both elementary counselors and other counselors. That is, consideration was given not only to numerical differences between groups which might be misinterpreted as absolute differences but to the differences between groups as to relative need structure as well.

### Summary

In order to determine to what extent prospective elementary school counselors differed from other prospective counselors in the manifestation of certain personality variables and also to discover what changes occurred in personality variables during the preparation of elementary counselors, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) was administered on a pre- and posttest basis to enrollees at four Counseling and Guidance Institutes. The sample consisted of a group of 59 prospective elementary school counselors and a group of 60 prospective counselors for other educational levels.

Both tests were administered at the conducting institutions, and the results were scored and processed at the University of Florida. The  $t$  test of significance of the difference in the means was the basic statistical technique employed in the investigation. Additional consideration was accorded the relative strength of each need.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION OF DATA

For each of three hypotheses tested by this investigation, an initial presentation will compare results of all scales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). For those scales which support a given hypothesis, several additional comparisons will be included so that the contribution of other factors can be determined. Finally, attention will be given to relative strength and patterns of personality needs for the original groups.

#### First Hypothesis

The first hypothesis was that statistically significant differences would be observed between manifest needs of prospective elementary school counselors and those of other prospective counselors at the beginning of academic preparation. Table 2 summarizes data pertinent to this hypothesis.

Three scales--Deference, Abasement, and Aggression--differentiate between elementary counselors and other counselors. Elementary counselors exhibit a significantly greater need for Deference than do other counselors, but their manifest need for Abasement and Aggression is less.

It was realized that statistical differences could result from factors other than choice of a particular level of counseling. As

Table 2  
Comparison of Elementary Counselors and Other  
Counselors on the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	<u>Elementary Counselors<sup>a</sup></u>		<u>Other Counselors<sup>b</sup></u>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Ach	15.69	4.48	14.83	4.11	1.19	1.09
Def	14.34	3.62	11.90	3.83	1.12	3.57 <sup>d</sup>
Ord	10.08	4.12	9.13	4.47	1.18	1.21
Exh	13.25	3.49	13.58	3.04	1.31	.55
Aut	12.86	4.47	13.88	4.09	1.19	1.30
Aff	16.20	4.27	15.27	4.11	1.08	1.21
Int	20.08	4.95	19.03	4.57	1.17	1.20
Suc	10.25	4.34	10.77	4.60	1.13	.63
Dom	16.24	5.22	15.57	5.27	1.02	.70
Aba	10.81	4.97	12.65	4.99	1.01	2.02 <sup>c</sup>
Nur	14.58	4.72	15.00	5.36	1.29	.45
Chg	16.80	5.27	17.18	4.29	1.51	.43
End	13.29	4.56	12.12	5.08	1.24	1.32
Het	15.24	6.33	15.93	5.33	1.41	.64
Agg	10.27	3.92	13.15	4.27	1.19	3.83 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 59.

<sup>b</sup>N is 60.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .001 level.

already pointed out in Chapter III, previous research has shown that data such as these are susceptible to errors of interpretation because of unusually high or low scores at only one of a group of Institutes (Foley, 1964) and that sex differences are highly meaningful when evaluating this type of comparison (Jackson & Guba, 1957).

Tables 3 and 4 determine to what extent atypical scores at one Institute contribute to significant differences found in Table 2.

Table 3  
Comparison of Institute A and Institute B on  
Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Institute A <sup>a</sup>		Institute B <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	13.93	3.70	14.73	3.56	1.08	.85
Aba	11.45	5.12	10.20	4.82	1.13	.89
Agg	10.31	4.68	10.23	3.08	2.31 <sup>c</sup>	.08

<sup>a</sup>N is 29.

<sup>b</sup>N is 30.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

Table 3 shows that scales which lend support to the first hypothesis do not differ significantly for two elementary Institutes.

Table 4, however, indicates that for Abasement the statistical difference between elementary counselors and other counselors is largely due to significantly higher scores at Institute D. Other counselors at Institute C reveal a need for Abasement similar to that of elementary counselors.

Table 4

Comparison of Institute C and Institute D on  
Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Institute C <sup>a</sup>		Institute D <sup>a</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	11.17	4.38	12.63	3.10	1.99	1.49
Aba	11.33	4.92	13.97	4.79	1.06	2.11 <sup>b</sup>
Agg	13.37	4.59	12.93	3.99	1.32	.40

<sup>a</sup>N is 30.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at .05 level.

Tables 5-9 illustrate the influence that difference in sex has upon findings in Table 2.

Table 5

Comparison of All Men and All Women on  
Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Men <sup>a</sup>		Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	12.80	3.16	13.65	4.36	1.90 <sup>c</sup>	1.12
Aba	11.45	4.81	12.26	5.45	1.28	.84
Agg	12.82	3.81	9.79	4.55	1.42	3.88 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 76.

<sup>b</sup>N is 43.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .001 level.



Table 6

Comparison of Elementary Men and Elementary Women  
on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Elementary Men <sup>a</sup>		Elementary Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	13.74	2.84	15.16	4.40	2.40 <sup>c</sup>	1.41
Aba	10.79	4.78	10.84	5.31	1.24	.04
Agg	10.94	4.49	8.96	3.94	1.29	1.76

<sup>a</sup>N is 34.

<sup>b</sup>N is 25.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

Table 7

Comparison of Other Men and Other Women on  
Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Other Men <sup>a</sup>		Other Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	12.29	3.22	11.56	3.40	1.12	.79
Aba	11.98	4.83	14.22	5.15	1.14	1.61
Agg	14.10	3.48	10.94	5.17	2.21	2.77 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 42.

<sup>b</sup>N is 18.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .01 level.

Table 8

Comparison of Elementary Men and Other Men  
on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Elementary Men <sup>a</sup>		Other men <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	13.74	2.84	12.29	3.22	1.28	2.06 <sup>c</sup>
Aba	10.79	4.78	11.98	4.83	1.02	1.07
Agg	10.94	4.49	14.10	3.48	1.66	3.46 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 34.

<sup>b</sup>N is 42.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .001 level.

Table 9

Comparison of Elementary Women and Other Women  
on Selected Scales of the EPPS--Pretest

Scale	Elementary Women <sup>a</sup>		Other Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	15.16	4.40	11.56	3.40	1.68	2.90 <sup>d</sup>
Aba	10.84	5.31	14.22	5.15	1.06	2.08 <sup>c</sup>
Agg	8.96	3.94	10.94	5.17	1.72	1.43

<sup>a</sup>N is 25.

<sup>b</sup>N is 18.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .01 level.

Table 5 indicates that difference for Aggression is largely a function of sex, since men reveal much greater need for Aggression than do women.

Table 6 reveals no significant differences between elementary men and elementary women for scales which support the first hypothesis.

Table 7 supplies much of the explanation for findings in Table 5; i.e., other men demonstrate a greater need for Aggression than do other women.

Table 8 illustrates that despite findings presented in Tables 5 and 7 implying influence of sex, some of the significant difference for Aggression is, in fact, due to lesser need for elementary men than for other men. That elementary counselors have significantly greater need for Deference than do other counselors gains support from data in Table 8, since elementary men express a greater need than do other men.

Data in Table 9 relating to need for Deference are compatible with those presented in Table 8. Elementary women have a significantly higher need than do other women. This table also indicates that much of the difference in Abasement occurs because elementary women have lesser need than do other women.

It should be noted that the EPPS is a forced-choice instrument. Therefore, each subject by indicating a given need did so at the expense of another need. All scores, whether for an individual or for a group, are relative and should not be interpreted as representing absolute needs. To compare two groups of relative scores and assume differences to be absolute is to accord data a stature hardly deserved.

Thus, differences in personality need as presented in Table 2 and supplemented by Tables 3-9 require additional examination, preferably from a different perspective.

Table 10, rather than making direct comparisons of mean scores, focuses upon patterns of need as manifested by elementary counselors and other counselors. This approach permits a comparison of relative need structures for both groups.

Of three scales which support the first hypothesis, Deference is the best discriminator between elementary counselors and other counselors when overall pattern of need is considered. It ranks eighth for elementary counselors but only 13th for other counselors. Aggression and Abasement, however, differentiate no more than do Heterosexuality, Endurance, and Autonomy, needs which rejected the first hypothesis. Aggression is 13th for elementary counselors and 10th for other counselors; Abasement ranks 12th and 11th, respectively.

### Second Hypothesis

The second hypothesis was that statistically significant differences would be observed between manifest needs of prospective elementary school counselors and those of other prospective counselors at completion of academic preparation. Table 11 presents the initial comparison of data relating to this question. Elementary counselors are seen to differ from other counselors only in a lesser need for Intraception.

It was again felt that supplemental attention should be given other factors. Tables 12 and 13 assess what influence atypical scores

Table 10

Rank Order of Needs for Elementary Counselors and Other Counselors on the EPPS--Pretest

Rank	Elementary Counselors <sup>a</sup>		Other Counselors <sup>b</sup>	
	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean
1	Intracception	20.08	Intracception	19.03
2	Change	16.80	Change	17.18
3	Dominance	16.24	Heterosexuality	15.93
4	Affiliation	16.20	Dominance	15.57
5	Achievement	15.69	Affiliation	15.27
6	Heterosexuality	15.24	Nurturance	15.00
7	Nurturance	14.58	Achievement	14.83
8	<u>Deference</u>	14.34	Autonomy	13.88
9	Endurance	13.29	Exhibition	13.56
10	Exhibition	13.25	<u>Aggression</u>	13.15
11	Autonomy	12.86	<u>Abasement</u>	12.65
12	<u>Abasement</u>	10.81	Endurance	12.12
13	<u>Aggression</u>	10.27	<u>Deference</u>	11.90
14	Succorance	10.25	Succorance	10.77
15	Order	10.08	Order	9.13

Note.--Rho equals .88.

<sup>a</sup>N is 59.

<sup>b</sup>N is 60.

Table 11  
Comparison of Elementary Counselors and Other  
Counselors on the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Elementary Counselors <sup>a</sup>		Other Counselors <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Ach	14.91	3.87	14.37	4.28	1.23	.71
Def	12.43	3.48	11.35	3.10	1.26	1.77
Ord	8.80	3.84	8.12	4.47	1.35	.88
Exh	14.46	3.73	13.58	2.99	1.56	1.41
Aut	14.25	4.93	15.07	3.96	1.55	.99
Aff	17.16	4.06	16.48	4.22	1.08	.88
Int	17.96	4.79	20.47	4.66	1.06	2.86 <sup>c</sup>
Suc	10.13	4.34	11.10	4.56	1.10	1.17
Dom	15.46	4.87	15.12	4.62	1.11	.39
Aba	9.36	5.28	10.88	4.58	1.33	1.66
Nur	15.25	4.43	15.53	4.77	1.16	.33
Chg	17.11	4.50	15.88	4.46	1.02	1.48
End	11.82	4.08	10.30	4.27	1.10	1.96
Het	19.93	5.75	19.40	4.73	1.48	.54
Agg	10.96	4.60	12.35	3.87	1.41	1.77

<sup>a</sup>N is 56.

<sup>b</sup>N is 60.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .01 level.

Table 12  
Comparison of Institute A and Institute B on a  
Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Institute A <sup>a</sup>		Institute B <sup>a</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	17.29	5.24	18.64	4.28	1.50	1.06

<sup>a</sup>N is 28

Table 13  
Comparison of Institute C and Institute D on a  
Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Institute C <sup>a</sup>		Institute D <sup>a</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	19.23	3.76	21.70	5.18	1.90	2.11 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 30.

<sup>b</sup>Significant at .05 level.



at a single institute might have upon the observed difference in Table 11.

Table 12 shows that intraception is not significantly different for two elementary institutes.

However, Table 13 reveals that significantly higher scores at Institute D account for much of the apparent difference between elementary counselors and other counselors. In need for intraception, other counselors at Institute C resemble elementary counselors more than they do enrollees at Institute D.

Tables 14-18 deal with influence of sex on need for intraception.

Table 14  
Comparison of All Men and All Women on a  
Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Men <sup>a</sup>		Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	19.36	5.00	19.07	4.67	1.15	.31

<sup>a</sup>N is 75.

<sup>b</sup>N is 41.

Table 15

Comparison of Elementary Men and Elementary Women  
on a Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Elementary Men <sup>a</sup>		Elementary Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	17.76	4.91	18.26	4.71	1.08	.38

<sup>a</sup>N is 33.

<sup>b</sup>N is 23.

Table 16

Comparison of Other Men and Other Women on a  
Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Other Men <sup>a</sup>		Other Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	20.62	4.76	20.11	4.52	1.11	.39

<sup>a</sup>N is 42.

<sup>b</sup>N is 18.

Table 17

Comparison of Elementary Men and Other Men on a  
Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Elementary Men <sup>a</sup>		Other Men <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	17.76	4.91	20.62	4.76	1.06	2.55 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 33.

<sup>b</sup>N is 42.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

Table 18  
Comparison of Elementary Women and Other Women on a  
Selected Scale of the EPPS--Posttest

Scale	Elementary Women <sup>a</sup>		Other Women <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Int	18.26	4.71	20.11	4.52	1.09	1.27

<sup>a</sup>N is 23.

<sup>b</sup>N is 18.

Tables 14, 15, and 16 do not reveal appreciable influence of a sex factor upon the difference observed in Table 11.

Table 17 supplies some of the reason for findings in Table 11; i.e., elementary men have less need for Intraception than do other men.

No significant difference between elementary women and other women is noted in Table 18 however.

Table 19 presents a comparison of patterns of need similar to that done for pretest data.

It is evident from Table 19 that despite a significant difference in means there is virtually no difference between elementary counselors and other counselors in need for Intraception when it is compared with other personality needs. In contrast, Endurance, which does not quite reach significance at the .05 level in Table 11 and ranks 11th in importance for elementary counselors but only 14th for other counselors, accounts for a rather considerable measure of the slight difference between patterns of need.

Table 19

Rank Order of Needs for Elementary Counselors and  
Other Counselors on the EPPS--Posttest

Rank	Elementary Counselors <sup>a</sup>		Other Counselors <sup>b</sup>	
	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean
1	Heterosexuality	19.93	<u>Intracception</u>	20.47
2	<u>Intracception</u>	17.96	Heterosexuality	19.40
3	Affiliation	17.16	Affiliation	16.48
4	Change	17.11	Change	15.88
5	Dominance	15.46	Nurturance	15.53
6	Nurturance	15.25	Dominance	15.12
7	Achievement	14.91	Autonomy	15.07
8	Exhibition	14.46	Achievement	14.37
9	Autonomy	14.25	Exhibition	13.58
10	Deference	12.43	Aggression	12.35
11	Endurance	11.82	Deference	11.35
12	Aggression	10.96	Succorance	11.10
13	Succorance	10.13	Abasement	10.88
14	Abasement	9.36	Endurance	10.30
15	Order	8.80	Order	8.12

Note.--Rho equals .95.

<sup>a</sup>N is 56.

<sup>b</sup>N is 60.

### Third Hypothesis

The third hypothesis was that statistically significant changes would occur in need of prospective elementary school counselors between the beginning and end of academic preparation. Table 20 compares results of pretest and posttest.

As seen in Table 20, three needs of elementary counselors changed significantly during academic preparation. Needs for Deference and Intraception decreased, and need for Heterosexuality increased.

Once more it was believed that scrutiny of subsidiary issues might prove meaningful. Tables 21 and 22 illustrate that changes actually occurred at only one of two elementary Institutes.

Examination of data in Tables 21 and 22 reveals that much of the change for Deference occurs at Institute A. However, for Heterosexuality there is evidence of significant change at both elementary Institutes. Intraception does not reach statistical significance for either elementary Institute alone although it does when all elementary counselors are considered together, and  $\bar{N}$  is significantly larger.

Tables 23 and 24 deal with statistical differences by sex. It is seen in Tables 23 and 24 that much of the observed change in Deference results from change in women elementary counselors. Both men and women display significant change in need for Heterosexuality; however, change for men is more significant. Again, neither subgroup exhibits a statistically significant change for Intraception.

Table 20  
Comparison of EPPS Pretest and Posttest--  
Elementary Counselors

Scale	Pretest <sup>a</sup>		Posttest <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Ach	15.69	4.48	14.91	3.87	1.34	1.00
Def	14.34	3.62	12.43	3.48	1.08	2.88 <sup>d</sup>
Ord	10.08	4.12	8.80	3.84	1.15	1.72
Exh	13.25	3.49	14.46	3.73	1.15	1.80
Aut	12.86	4.47	14.25	4.93	1.22	1.58
Aff	16.20	4.27	17.16	4.06	1.11	1.23
Int	20.08	4.95	17.96	4.79	1.07	2.33 <sup>c</sup>
Suc	10.25	4.34	10.13	4.34	1.00	.15
Dom	16.24	5.22	15.46	4.87	1.15	.83
Aba	10.81	4.97	9.36	5.28	1.13	1.52
Nur	14.58	4.72	15.25	4.43	1.14	.78
Chg	16.80	5.27	17.11	4.50	1.38	.34
End	13.29	4.56	11.82	4.08	1.25	1.82
Het	15.24	6.33	19.93	5.75	1.22	4.15 <sup>e</sup>
Agg	10.27	3.92	10.96	4.60	1.38	.87

<sup>a</sup>N is 59.

<sup>b</sup>N is 56.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .01 level.

<sup>e</sup>Significant at .001 level.

Table 21  
Comparison of EPPS Pretest and  
Posttest--Institute A

Scale	Pretest <sup>a</sup>		Posttest <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	13.93	3.70	11.75	3.59	1.07	2.26 <sup>c</sup>
Int	19.79	4.91	17.29	5.24	1.14	1.86
Het	15.24	6.74	20.07	4.71	2.05	3.13 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 29.

<sup>b</sup>N is 28.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

<sup>d</sup>Significant at .01 level.

Table 22  
Comparison of EPPS Pretest and  
Posttest--Institute B

Scale	Pretest <sup>a</sup>		Posttest <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	14.73	3.56	13.11	3.30	1.16	1.79
Int	20.37	5.05	18.64	4.28	1.40	1.40
Het	15.23	6.03	19.79	6.71	1.24	2.73 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 30.

<sup>b</sup>N is 28.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .01 level.



Table 23  
Comparison of EPPS Pretest and  
Posttest--Elementary Men

Scale	Pretest <sup>a</sup>		Posttest <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	13.74	2.84	12.36	3.26	1.31	1.85
Int	19.82	5.38	17.76	4.91	1.20	1.64
Het	15.85	5.91	20.24	4.94	1.43	3.30 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 34.

<sup>b</sup>N is 33.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .01 level.

Table 24  
Comparison of EPPS Pretest and  
Posttest--Elementary Women

Scale	Pretest <sup>a</sup>		Posttest <sup>b</sup>		F	t
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Def	15.16	4.40	12.52	3.86	1.30	2.20 <sup>c</sup>
Int	20.44	4.38	18.26	4.71	1.16	1.66
Het	14.40	6.90	19.48	6.83	1.02	2.56 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>N is 25.

<sup>b</sup>N is 23.

<sup>c</sup>Significant at .05 level.

As was the practice for Hypotheses 1 and 2, additional consideration was accorded rank order so that changes in structure of need could be noted. Table 25 includes these data.

Table 25 shows that of three scales changing significantly between pretest and posttest only Heterosexuality retains much meaning when overall pattern of need is examined. Only ranked sixth in importance early in training, need for Heterosexuality is first at the time of the posttest. On the other hand, needs for Intraception and Deference changed no more in rank order than did several other scales which do not support the third hypothesis. Intraception changed from first to second in rank; Deference dropped from eighth to 10th.

### Summary

Null hypotheses were tested for three major questions posed in this study. Scales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule which rejected a null hypothesis, thus supporting a stated hypothesis, were subjected to additional comparisons in order to determine merit of the initial finding.

### First Hypothesis

At the beginning of academic preparation there were three significant differences between needs of prospective elementary school counselors and those of other prospective counselors. Elementary counselors' need for Deference was greater at the .001 level of significance. Additional comparisons designed to assess influence of factors other than choice of counseling level added support to this discovery.

Table 25

Rank Order of Needs for Elementary Counselors  
on the EPPS--Pretest and Posttest

Rank	Pretest <sup>a</sup>		Posttest <sup>b</sup>	
	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean
1	<u>Intraception</u>	20.08	<u>Heterosexuality</u>	19.93
2	Change	16.80	<u>Intraception</u>	17.96
3	Dominance	16.24	Affiliation	17.16
4	Affiliation	16.20	Change	17.11
5	Achievement	15.69	Dominance	15.46
6	<u>Heterosexuality</u>	15.24	Nurturance	15.25
7	Nurturance	14.53	Achievement	14.91
8	<u>Deference</u>	14.34	Exhibition	14.46
9	Endurance	13.29	Autonomy	14.25
10	Exhibition	13.25	<u>Deference</u>	12.43
11	Autonomy	12.86	Endurance	11.82
12	Abasement	10.81	Aggression	10.96
13	Aggression	10.27	Succorance	10.13
14	Succorance	10.25	Abasement	9.36
15	Order	10.08	Order	8.80

Note.--Rho equals .89.

<sup>a</sup>N is 59.

<sup>b</sup>N is 56.

Both elementary men and elementary women demonstrated greater need for Deference than their counterparts at other institutes. Further, relative need for Deference was clearly more important for elementary counselors than for other counselors.

Elementary counselors manifested less need for Aggression than did other counselors. This difference was significant at the .001 level also. Attempts to evaluate influence of sex met with mixed results. It was obvious that men expressed greater need for Aggression than did women, especially among other counselors. Nevertheless, choice of counseling level had relevance also, since elementary men had less need for Aggression than did other men. When rank order was considered, Aggression proved less important for elementary counselors than for other counselors although the difference was not striking.

Elementary counselors' need for Abasement was less than that of other counselors at the .05 level of significance. This discovery received little support from supplemental investigations. Elementary women were significantly different from other women, but difference between elementary men and other men was not significant. It was also discovered that much of the apparent difference was due to higher scores at only one of two institutes preparing other counselors. Difference in rank order was not meaningful.

It is seen that although three needs--Deference, Aggression, and Abasement--differentiated somewhat between elementary counselors and other counselors at the beginning of training, the most meaningful discriminator was Deference. Supplemental comparisons lent only

support to this observation. Influence of factors other than choice of counseling level detracted from the meaningfulness of apparent differences in need for Aggression and Abasement.

### Second Hypothesis

By the end of academic preparation elementary counselors had become even more similar to other counselors. Only one need, Intraception, was significantly different; elementary counselors' need was less at the .01 level of significance.

The importance of this finding was minimized by the additional discovery that this difference was more significant for men than for women and, further, was largely accounted for by elevated scores at only one of two other Institutes. When rank order was examined there was virtually no difference in importance of Intraception.

### Third Hypothesis

Three needs changed significantly for elementary counselors during an academic-year Counseling and Guidance Institute.

Need for Heterosexuality increased for elementary counselors, the difference exceeding that required for the .001 level of significance. When influence of factors other than choice of counseling level were examined, nothing was found which detracted from this discovery. Significant increase in need for Heterosexuality was evident at both elementary Institutes, and both men and women increased in this need, although change was greater for men than for women. Further, when rank order was considered, Heterosexuality rose in importance rather dramatically. Only sixth in importance at the beginning of the year,

It ranked first among manifest needs of elementary counselors at completion of an academic year.

Need for Deference decreased at the .01 level of significance. Supplemental investigations disclosed that this change was significant at only one of two Institutes and that elementary women's need decreased more than did that of elementary men. When rank order at beginning and end of training was considered, change in need for Deference was not meaningful.

Elementary counselors' needs for intraception also decreased during the year. The level of significance was .05. Additional comparisons revealed a statistical peculiarity; neither men nor women when considered separately nor neither institute taken alone changed significantly for this need. A slight drop in rank order was unimportant.

Although need for Heterosexuality, Deference, and intraception changed statistically between the beginning and end of academic preparation, change for Heterosexuality was not only most significant statistically but probably most meaningful as well. Subsidiary treatment of data elicited nothing to detract from this finding. Apparent change in need for Deference, however, deserves reservation, since other factors were discovered to be influential. Change for intraception seems genuine but of less consequence than that for Heterosexuality.

If answers to the three questions investigated in this study are viewed collectively, it is readily seen that elementary counselors were very similar in personal need to other counselors as preparation began and underwent changes during the year which resulted in a pattern

of need almost identical to that of other counselors. Both groups specified Intraception, Change, Heterosexuality, Affiliation, Dominance, and Nurturance as their most important needs. There was nothing to indicate a distinct "elementary counselor personality."



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Summary

This investigation was conducted because it is believed that counselor personality is a factor with considerable impact upon eventual outcome of the counseling relationship. Moreover, among important variables of this relationship, the counselor is one susceptible to the influence of counselor educators--an influence operating both through the selection process and during preparation itself.

In order for counselor educators to best facilitate desired personality growth, they must consider what personality characteristics are typical of beginning students in guidance and counseling and what changes are likely to be elicited by present programs. An expanding body of research is shedding light upon these issues, but no attention has previously been given to those planning to work as elementary school counselors.

This study used the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) on a pre- and posttest basis to compare personal needs of 59 prospective elementary school counselors with needs of 60 prospective counselors for other educational levels. It also examined changes in personal need which occurred during preparation of elementary counselors.

It was first hypothesized that significant differences between manifest need of elementary counselors and those of other counselors

would be discovered at the beginning of preparation. This hypothesis received little support. Although three scales of the EPPS resulted in a statistically significant difference between means, only difference in need for Deference remained meaningful when other analyses were conducted. Differences for Abasement and Aggression were influenced by factors other than choice of counseling level.

The second hypothesis predicted difference in need between elementary counselors and other counselors at the completion of an academic year. There was even less support for this hypothesis. Only one scale, Intraception, differed significantly, and this difference was largely a function of high scores at only one of two other institutes.

The third hypothesis stated that statistically significant changes would occur in manifest needs of prospective elementary school counselors during an academic year. Again, support was meager. Only scores for Deference, Intraception, and Heterosexuality changed significantly. Furthermore, supplemental comparisons tended to detract from the meaningfulness of change for Deference and Intraception. Change for Heterosexuality was more reliable.

### Conclusions

#### First Hypothesis

Only three variables of the EPPS discriminated beyond chance level between elementary counselors and other counselors at the beginning of preparation. Probably most important was greater need for Deference on the part of elementary counselors, both men and women.

Deference can be described as the need to conform to custom and tradition, to solicit opinions from others, to follow suggestions and take orders, and to rely upon others for decisions. It tends to preclude self-reliance and autonomy.

Previous research (Mott, 1962; Kemp, 1964; Smith, 1964) has revealed a consistently low need for Deference among counseling-oriented samples. Other counselors in the present study seemed to fit this pattern since Deference ranked 13th among all needs at the beginning of training (Table 10). Elementary counselors, however, exhibited a much greater need for Deference. It was greater at the .001 level of significance and ranked five places higher in rank order. For this need, elementary counselors were more similar to "veteran" teachers identified by Jackson & Guba (1957)--teachers who had "learned" to conform, to depend upon others for decisions, and to rely upon forces other than themselves for direction. Jackson & Guba discovered, however, that "novice" teachers had not yet "learned" to defer as readily as older colleagues. Thus, it may be that the difference observed in this study can be partly attributed to the fact that elementary counselors were somewhat older (Table 1) and, presumably, had longer prior service in the classroom. Whatever the reason, it is apparent that at the beginning of training elementary counselors expressed much less need to assume roles of leadership requiring decision-making for self and others.

Also differentiating were lesser needs for Abasement and Aggression by elementary counselors. Abasement is the need to feel

inferior to others, to experience frequent feelings of guilt, to accept blame for mistakes, to accept punishment willingly, and to feel inadequate to cope with many situations.

It is seen that one low in Abasement probably has a positive concept of self and feels little need for self-denegation. It might be hoped that this would be characteristic of prospective counselors; however, research described in Chapter II has not indicated such. Counseling-oriented professionals do not seem to differ significantly from other school-oriented occupational groups in need for Abasement. Neither does it seem accurate to say that elementary counselors in the present study had less need than did other counselors despite data in Table 2. Much of the observed difference was due to elevated scores at Institute D, while scores at Institute C resembled those of elementary counselors.

Aggression reflects the need to disagree with others, to criticize and attack others verbally, and to blame others for their shortcomings. Low Aggression foretells a relatively positive self concept with little need to react negatively to other's opinions. It would indicate security and ability to handle frustration in a manner not threatening to others.

Unlike Abasement, Aggression has been shown to be of relatively little importance to counselors when compared with other groups (Kemp, 1964; Smith, 1964). However, it is unsafe to say that elementary counselors, per se, are likely to manifest Aggression less than do other counselors. Data in Tables 5 and 7 indicate a considerably lesser need for women than for men. This discovery supplements work

by Scandrette (1962) which determined that Aggression was the least important need for both elementary and secondary women student teachers.

Thus, it is seen that at the beginning of training differences in need between elementary counselors and other counselors were minimal. Only three characteristics discriminated at a statistically significant level, and the differences for two of these, Abasement and Aggression, were largely influenced by factors other than choice of counseling level. Even Deference, which appeared to be most meaningful, might have been a function of protracted teaching experience. It must be concluded that prospective elementary school counselors differed very little from other prospective counselors in manifestation of personal needs at the beginning of preparation.

### Second Hypothesis

Although elementary counselors and other counselors were much alike during initial stages of preparation, the similarity was even more striking near the end. Only Intraception differed significantly. Intraception is the need to understand one's self, to observe and analyze the attitudes and behavior of others, and to experience empathy.

It would seem to be a characteristic desired for counselors. Intraception not only is part and parcel of the repertoire of the practicing counselor but also is a necessary ingredient for self-scrutiny prerequisite to personal growth and development. Although Table 11 shows lesser need for elementary counselors, supplementary data detracted somewhat from this finding and indicated that high

scores at Institute D accounted for much of the difference. Moreover, there was virtually no difference between groups in rank ordering of intraception.

It is apparent that slight differences in need had almost completely disappeared during training, and that by the end of the year the two groups presented virtually identical patterns of personal need. The EPPS has been able to identify a "counselor personality" in other studies, but this research provides no indication of an "elementary counselor personality" as such.

### Third Hypothesis

Three needs changed significantly for elementary counselors during the academic year. An increased manifest need for Heterosexuality was the most obvious change. It was true at both institutes and for both men and women and when compared with other needs jumped from sixth to first in importance. Heterosexuality is described as the need to interact socially, emotionally, intellectually, and physically with members of the opposite sex.

While it is possible that a dramatic increase in actual need for involvement with the opposite sex did occur, it must be remembered that the EPPS relies on self-report. It is also possible that an emphasis on openness and self-disclosure during the preceding academic year merely permitted increased candidness and honesty in reporting ever-present interest--an interest which had previously been suppressed in order to preserve the facade often expected of teachers. Jackson & Guba (1957) discovered that "veteran" teachers "learned" to subdue



overt interest in the opposite sex. Whether the data reflect a change in actual need or an increased willingness to report true feelings, results were consistent with change observed during other counselor education programs (Clark, 1959; Kenney, 1960).

Deference and Intraception, already defined in this chapter, also changed significantly. A decrease in Deference was consistent with change previously observed by Kenney (1960). It is believed that lesser need to defer to others is not as reliable as data in Table 20 might imply, since statistically significant change occurred at only one of the elementary institutes, and change was more true for women than for men.

A slight decrease in need to know about and understand self and others ran counter to findings of the only previous study to detect a significant change in Intraception, since Holt (1962) discovered increased Intraception resulting from an earlier Guidance institute. There was little change in rank order for the present investigation. Men and women, when examined separately, did not change significantly, nor did either institute when considered alone. All in all, there was much to minimize the importance of apparent change for Intraception.

It must be concluded that although three needs underwent statistically significant change during academic preparation, change for Deference and Intraception appears less reliable than that for Heterosexuality. Not all subgroups changed significantly for the first two needs; they did for Heterosexuality. Moreover, change for Heterosexuality substantiated results of previous research. Whether the results denote change in actual need or, rather, increased willingness to



disclose must remain a problem for conjecture; it is not a question which lends itself readily to solution by statistical research.

Several times the point has been made that various supplemental comparisons did not altogether substantiate findings of original comparisons as presented in Tables 2, 11, and 20. While this is not unimportant, neither must it be overemphasized. Invariably, a subgroup, whether an individual institute or a classification based on sex, differed in the same manner as that discovered in the original comparison. Virtually all supplemental investigations for selected variables of the EPPS revealed consistent results; only the degree of difference varied, not the direction.

Perhaps the most important conclusion to be drawn from this study pertains to the third hypothesis and is not apparent unless results are compared with those of Jackson & Guba (1957). They found that teachers differed significantly from national norms on five variables of the EPPS. Teachers were higher on Deference, Order, and Endurance and lower on Heterosexuality and Exhibition. Elementary counselors in this study moved in the opposite direction for all five of these needs, although movement was statistically significant for only Deference and Heterosexuality. That is, mean scores also dropped for Order and Endurance and rose for Exhibition. Moreover, change in rank ordering reflected the same trend. Deference dropped from eighth to 10th and Endurance from ninth to 11th. Order was last on both pretest and posttest. Not only did Heterosexuality rise in relative importance from sixth to first, but Exhibition rose from 10th to

eighth. It is seen that although change in manifest need was not striking, it was very definitely away from the need pattern of the classroom teacher.

### Implications

Since elementary counselors' needs were similar to those of other counselors at the beginning of preparation and because the resemblance was even more pronounced at the end, it might be expected that given reasonable freedom to structure their jobs these elementary counselors would operate in ways typical of most counselors; i.e., with an emphasis upon working directly with students, individually and in groups. There was nothing to indicate a pattern of personal need likely to be demanded by those responsibilities advocated by Faust (1965), Johnston (1966), Mahan (1965), and others. This point of view emphasizes consultation, coordination, and curriculum planning and has been described by Eckerson (1966).

I believe that consultation is the most important though not the only aspect of the role of the elementary school counselor. . . . Thus, the counselor should become a change-agent, a provocateur, a disturber of the peace. With consideration for feeling of defensiveness long engendered by the school establishment, the perceptive counselor will move slowly into discussions of change, helping school staff in self-analyses of classroom procedures, of school policies, and of system-wide educational philosophy. Two-way consultation with all adults interested in improving education for children would be the beginning of a continuing inquiry into what is happening to those for whom the schools exist. (p. 5 & p. 7)

These duties, which stress dynamic group leadership and rely upon skillful management of both people and the curriculum in order to facilitate student growth, seem to lie in a direction not likely to be

chosen by these elementary counselors. Their pattern of need included relatively high Intraception, Affiliation, and Nurturance combined with low Achievement, Exhibition, Endurance, Aggression, and Order, a combination which might well hinder this approach to guidance. Therefore, those who would promote elementary guidance responsibilities which emphasize creative and forceful influence upon the entire school program must make a deliberate effort during selection and/or during preparation to insure that future counselors possess personal characteristics prerequisite to these functions. This study demonstrates that this will not happen by chance.

The foregoing is not meant to imply, however, that goals of the two elementary institutes involved indicated that "consultants" were the expected product. Both advertised an emphasis on the counseling function. More meaningful research might have been possible if an institute had been included which stressed consulting and coordinating activities.

While it seems probable that these elementary counselors have since gravitated toward relationships dependent upon very personalized interaction, it is unsafe to predict this with certainty. A follow-up study attempting to identify "favored" or "most important" functions might be enlightening.

Investigations of a longitudinal nature are important for another reason. Other research has indicated that attitudes and personality characteristics true of counselor candidates are not always persistent after academic preparation has ended (Munger et al., 1963). Mott (1962) also reported a disturbing implication. She found that

in-service counselors and teacher-counselors were very unlike counselor-education majors but quite similar to her administrators and to teachers as described by Jackson & Guba (1957). It may be that students, consciously or unconsciously, assume what they perceive to be a professionally desirable stance during schooling only to "be themselves" after returning to the school setting. If so, "counselor personality" is a doubtful entity.

The major responsibility for assuring that counselors possess health-engendering personal characteristics would then lie with selection procedures. While most counselor education programs have elements of selection and retention built into them, many require little for admission and eventual endorsement other than ability to do graduate work. Development of a more sophisticated approach must rely upon a stated philosophy, the implementation of which must be operational. Whatever the philosophy, it follows that the likelihood of a rewarding educational experience is enhanced if the incoming student is receptive to purposes of the program. This does not mean that the program itself should not be expected to produce change. On the contrary, education which facilitates personal growth is undoubtedly the most meaningful, but the task becomes overwhelming if the student arrives with little capacity to change.

It is important that more effort be made to identify conditions which produce favorable change. Suggestions by Pierson (1965), discoveries by Clark (1959), and personal observations on the part of the writer during association with two groups of Guidance Institute

enrollees combine to suggest that examination of peer group interaction would be fruitful.

Two important limitations to this study should be mentioned. The first concerns the nature of the sample. Only four counselor education institutions were represented, and all reported similar goals featuring emphasis on the interpersonal encounter as demonstrated by the counseling relationship. In addition, groups involved were part of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance program and, therefore, generalization to all counselor education students would be capricious. There has been a tendency in recent years to concentrate personality research on institute populations with few attempts to relate findings to personality characteristics of students in non-institute programs of study. It is possible that much of the research reviewed in Chapter II is not altogether relevant to candidates in general. Knock (1966) has found, however, that this point of view might be prematurely pessimistic. He discovered that enrollees who had undergone intensive screening prior to admission to a Guidance Institute were no more 'student-centered' than non-screened trainees whose only qualification for counselor education had been admission to graduate school. Nevertheless, it seems a legitimate issue for further exploration.

Another limitation is the obvious disregard for relative effectiveness of counselors studied. Although no effort was made to ascertain what pattern of need identified effective counselors, it is realized that ultimately this is the critical issue. It is hoped that work directed to this question will establish effectiveness by examination of experiential content of interpersonal encounters rather than

depend upon response to standardized tests, rating scales, and other instruments somewhat divorced from actual counseling experience.

In conclusion, this study did not identify a pattern of personal need uniquely characteristic of elementary counselors but, rather, indicated that students at institutions geared to prepare elementary counselors possessed a pattern of need similar to that of prospective counselors for other educational levels. Furthermore, this pattern seemed more compatible with duties emphasizing interaction with students on a personal basis rather than with responsibilities requiring group leadership, curriculum-planning, and decision-making in a more impersonal fashion. There was indication that all elements of preparation, particularly selection, should be planned carefully, if the eventual professional is to be personally capable of functioning in a fashion consistent with the expectations of the preparing institution.

Questions related to this research which need further investigation include the following.

1. Can guidance services eventually provided by elementary counselors be predicted by pattern of personal need?
2. Is pattern of need as expressed "on-the-job" similar to that displayed during preparation?
3. What influence do peers have upon personality growth during academic preparation?
4. Do non-Institute students have a pattern of need similar to enrollees in Guidance Institutes, and does academic preparation influence their personal need in like fashion?

5. What pattern of personal need is related to effective counseling?

Answers to these and similar questions should permit counselor educators to utilize the EPPS and other personality measures to best advantage in planning for selection and preparation of elementary school counselors.



## REFERENCES

- American Personnel and Guidance Association. Joint ACES-ASCA committee on the elementary school counselor preliminary statement. Personnel guid. J., 1966, 44, 659-661.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. Standards for counselor education in the preparation of secondary school counselors. Personnel guid. J., 1964, 42, 1061-1073.
- Arbuckle, D. S. Five philosophical issues in counseling. J. counsel. Psychol., 1958, 5, 211-215.
- Barry, Ruth, & Wolf, Beverly. Five years of the Personnel and Guidance Journal. Personnel guid. J., 1958, 36, 549-555.
- Bauernfeind, R. H. The matter of "ipsative scores." Personnel guid. J., 1962, 41, 210-217.
- Bendig, A. W. Objective measures of needs and course achievement in introductory psychology. J. gen. Psychol., 1958, 59, 51-57.
- Bocchini, R. R. An exploratory investigation concerning characteristics of counselors-in-preparation. Diss. Abstr., 1962, 23, 1229-1230.
- Cash, W. L., & Munger, P. F. Counselors and their preparation. Rev. educ. Res., 1966, 36, 256-263.
- Caves, J. W. An evaluation of growth and change during a guidance and counseling training institute. Diss. Abstr., 1962, 22, 3517.
- Clark, M. C. Changes in response patterns of counseling institute trainees. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1959.
- Cottle, W. C. Personal characteristics of counselors: I. a review of the literature. Personnel guid. J., 1953, 31, 445-450.
- Cottle, W. C., & Lewis, W. W. Personality characteristics of counselors: II. male counselor responses to the MMPI and GZTS. J. counsel. Psychol., 1954, 1, 27-30.
- Cottle, W. C., Lewis, W. W., & Penney, M. M. Personal characteristics of counselors: III. an experimental scale. J. counsel. Psychol., 1954, 1, 74-77.

- Cottle, W. C., Pownall, J. E., & Stelmel, R. J. Counselors and teachers take the experimental attitude scale. Personnel guid. J., 1955, 33, 374-378.
- Demos, G. D., & Zuwaylif, F. H. Counselor movement as a result of an intensive six-week training program in counseling. Personnel guid. J., 1963, 42, 125-128.
- Dugan, W. E. The impact of N. D. E. A. upon counselor preparation. Personnel guid. J., 1960, 39, 37-40.
- Eckerson, Louise. Consultation in the counselor's role: invitation to dialogue. Elem. Sch. Guid. Counsel., 1966, 1 (4), 5-8.
- Edwards, A. L. Statistical methods for the behavioral sciences. New York: Rinehart, 1954.
- Edwards, A. L. Manual: Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Edwards, A. L., & Thurstone, L. L. An internal consistency check for scale values determined by the method of successive intervals. Psychometrika, 1952, 17, 169-180.
- Faust, V. Elementary school counseling. In C. J. Daane, C. F. Combs, & C. G. Wrenn (Eds.), Developments in counseling. Tempe, Arizona: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, 1965. Pp. 15-21.
- Feldman, M. J., & Corah, N. C. Social desirability and the forced choice method. J. consult. Psychol., 1960, 24, 480-482.
- Foley, W. J. Empirical derivation of scales for the selection of counselor trainees. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1964.
- Foley, W. J., & Proff, F. C. NDEA Institute trainees and vocational rehabilitation counselors: a comparison of characteristics. Counselor Educ. Supervis., 1965, 4, 154-159.
- Gray, J. T. Needs and values in three occupations. Personnel guid. J., 1963, 42, 238-244.
- Hill, G. E. Elementary school guidance: criteria for approval by state departments of education. Counselor Educ. Supervis., 1963, 2, 137-143.
- Hill, G. E., & Green, D. A. The selection, preparation, and professionalization of guidance and personnel workers. Rev. educ. Res., 1960, 30, 115-130.

- Hill, G. E., & Nitzschke, D. F. Preparation programs in elementary school guidance. Personnel guid. J., 1961, 40, 155-159.
- Holt, F. D. A study of change in certain personality variables of counselors in training. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1962.
- Jackson, P. W., & Guba, E. G. The need structure of in-service teachers, an occupational analysis. Sch. Rev., 1957, 65, 176-192.
- Johnston, E. G. Waterford studies elementary school guidance. Elem. Sch. Guid. Counsel., 1966, 1 (3), 23-26.
- Jones, A. J. Principles of guidance and pupil personnel work. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.
- Jones, V. Attitude changes in an N. D. E. A. Institute. Personnel guid. J., 1963, 42, 387-392.
- Kemp, C. G. Comparative study of the need structures of administrators, teachers, and counselors. J. educ. Res., 1964, 57, 425-427.
- Kenney, R. C. An analysis of self perceptions in counselor trainees. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1960.
- Khatun, S. A comparative study of personality characteristics of the graduate students majoring in educational psychology and guidance with the graduate students of other areas of education at Colorado State College. Diss. Abstr., 1965, 26, 868-869.
- Knock, G. H. Comparative measurement of in-training school counselors, secondary school teachers and school administrators on a criterion of student-centeredness. Diss. Abstr., 1966, 26, 5236-5237.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. S., & Ballachey, E. L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Mahan, T. W. The elementary school counselor. National Elem. Principal, 1965, 44 (4), 72-74.
- Mann, J. H. Self-ratings and the EPPS. J. appl. Psychol., 1958, 42, 267-268.
- McDougall, W. P., & Reitan, H. M. The elementary school counselor as perceived by elementary principals. Personnel guid. J., 1963, 42, 348-354.

- Merrill, R. M. Comparison of education students, successful science teachers and educational administrators on the Edwards PPS. J. educ. Res., 1960, 54, 38-40.
- Moore, L. H. A Q-study of the role concepts for elementary school counselors held by school personnel in Missouri. Diss. Abstr., 1966, 26, 5240-5241.
- Mordock, J. B., & Patterson, C. H. Personality characteristics of counseling students at various levels of training. Voc. Guid. Quart., 1965, 13, 265-269.
- Morton, J. An investigation into the effects of an adult reading efficiency course. Occup. Psychol., 1959, 33, 222-237.
- Mott, Carol C. A study of personality variables among counselor education majors, counselors, and graduate students in administration, curriculum, and supervision as shown by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1962.
- Munger, P. F., & Johnson, C. A. Changes in attitudes associated with an NDEA counseling and guidance institute. Personnel guid. J., 1960, 38, 751-753.
- Munger, P. F., Myers, R. A., & Brown, Darline F. Guidance institutes and the persistence of attitudes: a progress report. Personnel guid. J., 1963, 41, 415-419.
- Murphy, G. The cultural context of guidance. In G. F. Farwell & H. J. Peters (Eds.), Guidance readings for counselors. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960.
- Murray, H. A. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford Press, 1938.
- Nelson, R. C. Let us reason together: five issues in elementary counseling. Elem. Sch. Guid. Counsel., 1966, 1 (3), 10-11.
- Ostle, B. Statistics in research. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1954.
- Pierson, G. A. An evaluation: counselor education in regular session institutes. Washington: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965.
- Quaranta, J. J. School counselor-in-training: emergence of role perceptions. Diss. Abstr., 1965, 25, 7085-7086.

- Radcliffe, J. A. (A review of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule) in O. K. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements year-book. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Rochester, D. D. Attitude and personality changes of counselor trainees in eight academic year long NDEA guidance and counseling institutes. Diss. Abstr., 1966, 26, 4458.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C. R. The interpersonal relationship: the core of guidance. Harvard educ. Rev., 1962, 32, 416-429.
- Santavicca, C. G. Supervised experience and selection of counselor trainees. Personnel guid. J., 1959, 38, 195-197.
- Scandrette, Onas. Differential need patterns of women elementary and secondary level student teachers. J. educ. Res., 1962, 55, 376-379.
- Seagars, J. E., & McDonald, R. L. The role of interaction groups in counselor education. J. counsel. Psychol., 1963, 10, 156-162.
- Shertzer, B., & Stone, S. C. Fundamentals of guidance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Smith, A. C. A comparison of Edwards Personal Preference Schedule patterns of doctoral graduates in guidance and counseling with other doctoral graduates in education. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.
- Steffire, B., King, P., & Leafgren, F. Characteristics of counselors judged effective by their peers. J. counsel. Psychol., 1962, 9, 335-340.
- Steffire, B., & Leafgren, F. Value differences between counselors and administrators. Voc. Guid. Quart., 1962, 10, 226-228.
- Stricker, L. J. (A review of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule) in O. K. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements year-book. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Stripling, R. O., & Lister, J. L. Selection, preparation, and professionalization of specialists. Rev. educ. Res., 1963, 33, 171-178.
- Tyler, L. E. The work of the counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Guidance for children in elementary schools. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965. (a)
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. NDEA counseling and guidance institutes. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965. (b)
- Walker, Helen M., & Lev, J. Statistical inference. New York: Henry Holt, 1953.
- Webb, A. P., & Harris, J. T. A semantic differential study of counselors in an NDEA Institute. Personnel guid. J., 1963, 42, 260-263.
- Wellman, F. E. Selection of students for preparation in college personnel work. Personnel guid. J., 1955, 34, 24-27.
- Whetstone, B. D. A differential study of some personality variables of selected counselors and effective teachers. Diss. Abstr., 1964, 24, 4090-4091.
- Whetstone, B. D. Personality differences between selected counselors and effective teachers. Personnel guid. J., 1965, 43, 886-890.
- Winkler, R. C., Munger, P. F., Gust, C. T., & Telgland, J. J. Changes in the concepts of self and others of NDEA guidance Institute members. J. counsel. Psychol., 1963, 10, 227-231.
- Wrightsmen, L. S., Richard, W. C., & Noble, F. C. Attitude changes of guidance Institute participants. Counselor Educ. Supervis., 1966, 4, 212-220.
- Wyatt, F. The self-experience of the psychotherapist. J. consult. Psychol., 1948, 12, 82-88.



## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Harry Alfred Danielson was born March 28, 1932, at Warren, Pennsylvania. He was graduated from Warren High School in 1950 and received the Bachelor of Science degree in education from Indiana State Teachers College, Indiana, Pennsylvania in 1954.

During the next six years Mr. Danielson served in the United States Army and taught business education subjects at three Pennsylvania high schools. He also attended Pennsylvania State University during summer sessions and, in 1960, received the Master of Education degree with a major in counseling. He accepted a position as Home and School Visitor with the Warren, Pennsylvania schools in September, 1960 and worked in that capacity for the next four years. His responsibilities emphasized counseling activities with elementary school children.

Mr. Danielson entered the doctoral program of the Department of Personnel Services at the University of Florida in September, 1964. He worked as administrative assistant for NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes during 1964-65 and 1965-66 and also served as instructor for undergraduate classes in guidance.

Mr. Danielson is married to the former Marjorie Hoyer Billstone. Their family includes three boys: Jay, Richard, and James. He holds membership in the American Personnel and Guidance Association, American College Personnel Association, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, North Florida Personnel and Guidance Association, Phi



Delta Kappa, and Kappa Delta Pi. Mr. Danielson is presently a counselor for undergraduates with the College of Education, University of Florida.

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the chairman of the candidate's supervisory committee and has been approved by all members of that committee. It was submitted to the Dean of the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

April, 1967

Kimball Wiles  
Dean, College of Education

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean, Graduate School

Supervisory Committee:

Bert L. Sharp  
Chairman

James L. Lister

Audrey S. Schumacher